

finally close a loophole that should have been closed years and years ago.

The bottom line is we can't borrow and spend. We have to pay for the things that we want. It is a bipartisan bill, it is not a tax increase, and I ask my colleagues to support our farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE), one of our other new Members, and a great member of the committee, for 1 minute.

Mr. SPACE. Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Kind amendment, and I do so on behalf of the farmers of Ohio's 18th Congressional District. They are a very diverse bunch, but one thing they all have in common is that they are small, family-run operations.

They asked for several things in this farm bill: conservation, energy, and a safety net. This bill as it has come out of committee provides those things that will allow those farmers to continue to do business. Those farmers operate on extremely narrow margins, and without a safety net that mitigates their risks, they can no longer do business.

Madam Chairman, the people of this country are already experiencing increased rates for gasoline, for utilities, for health care. The last thing that we can afford in this country is to see a spike in the price of food.

Madam Chairman, I rise once again in opposition to the Kind amendment and in favor of the bill as it has come out of the committee.

□ 2145

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, we have no further speakers on the legislation. I yield back.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to recognize for 1 minute my good friend and neighbor from Minnesota, a new member of our committee, Mr. WALZ.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the chairman and my good friend for the work he's done, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the ranking member for making the experience in the Ag Committee as rewarding as it's been.

I rise in opposition to my good friend from Wisconsin's piece of legislation. It's well meaning, but I believe it does not address the needs of my district. The people of the First District of Minnesota, I think, can probably lay claim to one of the richest agricultural pieces of land in the entire world. We lead in production of soybeans, near the top in corn production, turkeys and pork.

This is a bill that is supported. I had 14 hearings throughout my district with universal acceptance of making sure the safety net is maintained, improving our conservation programs and strengthening rural America.

When I hear about record high prices, the people of this Chamber and the people of America need to know the price of corn has dropped 25 percent in the

last month. Farmers know it won't always remain that way.

When I need advice on the farm bill, I go to a couple of good farmers in my district, Kevin Papp, president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau, and Doug Peterson, president of Minnesota's Farmers Union. I don't need to go to the ideologues at the Cato Institute or Club for Growth to know what's good for rural America.

I oppose this amendment and support the chairman's mark.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) for 1 minute.

Mr. POMEROY. I was really surprised to hear my colleague, Mr. FLAKE, say, in talking about his bill, that farmers participating in the farm program are something like grown children living in the parents' basement. What a complete affront to the hardworking family farmers producing our Nation's food all across this country.

It also shows a profound ignorance in just what's involved in family farming, tremendous capital exposed every year you put that crop and risks you can't control, price collapse, crop failure. And the only thing that's going to keep family farmers as our backbone for U.S. food production is a farm program that helps allay these risks.

What do we want for our future, vast corporate-style ag production or family farmers producing the abundant food, the high quality, the low cost we've come to enjoy in our food supply in this country?

I know what the people back home represent. They want family farms, and that's why they want this farm bill.

Vote "no" on Kind; "yes" on the farm bill.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Madam Chairman, change in this place is very difficult. In fact, sometimes the toughest thing to accomplish is changing the status quo.

But the fundamental fact is that when you've got two-thirds of the subsidy program in this farm bill going to just 30 congressional districts who are well represented on the committee, I think it's unrealistic to expect that that committee's going to produce a policy statement that embraces reform and new ideas. I should know. I used to serve on the committee. And I'm not being critical. That's just a fact. They have their districts to represent as we have districts to represent as well.

My district takes a hit under this reform bill. But sometimes it takes a group of well-intentioned individuals to move the cause of reform forward, and that's what we're trying to do tonight.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I acknowledge and do not disparage the work of the committee. Let us consider, though, how much better we can do—for consumers, for the Northeast, for New Jersey, for specialty crop growers, for small farmers, for nutrition programs, for our common environment.

By shifting from obsolete programs the Kind amendment provides an additional \$1.2 billion above the committee bill for fruit and vegetable growers—tripling the Farmer Market Promotion Program, making \$500 million mandatory for Specialty Crop Research, making \$150 million mandatory for Community Food Projects, and providing hundreds of millions of dollars for community supported agriculture, and the School Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.

I want to emphasize that the Kind amendment would provide \$3 billion more than the committee bill to conservation programs.

Support for the Kind amendment is broad and diverse including environmental and conservation groups, nutrition groups and groups that serve low-income Americans, specialty crop and organic farmers, and taxpayer groups. This is a sensible amendment. Indeed, the proposal by Mr. Kind, the gentleman from Wisconsin, is a remarkable, admirable legislative reform. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Kind-Flake amendment, and in support of H.R. 2419, the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007.

Madam Chairman, the Kind-Flake amendment is nothing more than a veiled attempt at pulling the rug out from underneath of this nation's hardworking family farmers and those in the rural South who till the land of our nation to provide us with a safe, healthy, and robust food supply—often with little or no profit for themselves.

Increasingly, we are relying on our farmers on many fronts—namely, to clothe, feed and, now, fuel our nation. The Kind-Flake amendment would divert us from reaching that goal by discouraging domestic crop production, dismantling our hope for energy innovation and independence, and increasing the trade deficit with countries that threaten our economic competitiveness.

Indeed, the Kind-Flake proposal would take away the farm safety net and put U.S. farmers and ranchers in unfair competition against heavily subsidized foreign producers, many of whom are protected by much higher import tariffs than those imposed by the United States.

In recent months, we have heard horrific accounts of how agricultural products are grown and how food is manufactured abroad, especially in China, whose rapidly growing, already behemoth-sized economy now imports \$2.26 billion worth of food into this country each year. Do we really want to reduce the incentive for our domestic producers to grow their own, and rely more from these foreign countries with proven histories of lax food safety standards and tendencies to include poisonous additives into their products? I surely hope not.

Furthermore, in lowering the AGI limitation to \$250,000, the Kind-Flake proposal is not drawn narrowly, as its supporters claim, but instead casts a wide net—it would eliminate over 38,000 current recipients from being covered by a farm safety net.

The Kind-Flake proposal also misrepresents itself by touting its revenue-based counter cyclical payments as revolutionary, and as a superior alternative to the traditional counter-cyclical program. This completely ignores the fact that the Agricultural Committee's markup includes a revenue based counter-cyclical payment option!